

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's January 29, 2004, Official Action and respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following comments.

Claims 1-16 have been canceled, and new claims 17-24 added. Claims 17-24 remain in the application for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scheibel '475. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection especially as applied to new claims 17-24.

New claims 17-24 have been drafted to better identify the structural differences and the result achieved therefrom from those of Scheibel as set out on pages 4 and 5 of Applicant's December 1, 2003 response, which response Applicant requests be incorporated herein by reference. Clearly, the Scheibel device does not teach the forming of an "ice-lining" or the engagement of a liquid material into such ice-lining in a uniform thickness as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant submits that the invention is new and unobvious and not disclosed by the cited art. Accordingly,

Appl. No. 10/035,421  
Amendment dated February 26, 2004

Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner's early review and issuance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\N\Niiz\akimoto4\pto\RCE-amend.doc